REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the application in light of the Final Office Action dated December 1, 2006. Claims 1-23 are currently pending. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in accordance with the following remarks.

Section 102 Rejections

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,182,142 issued to *Win et al.* ("*Win*"). Applicant respectfully disagrees that the claims are unpatentable over *Win*.

Win teaches controlling access to one or more information resources by identifying a subset of resources that the user is authorized to access based on one or more roles that are stored in association with user identifying information (*Win*, column 2, lines 28-33). *Win* teaches that roles are developed by listing functions or capacities in which a person might act when they access Web resources and their functional group, department, or organizational unit (*Win*, column 14, lines 11-15).

Claim 1 recites:

> analyzing database access statements issued for an application in use;
>
> determining accessed items and types of access for the application based on the issued database access statements for the application; and
>
> developing a role associated with the application based on the determined accessed items and types of access, wherein the role allows a user database access when the user is associated with the application.

Win, however, does not teach developing a role associated with an application based on accessed items and types of access determined based on database access statements issued during the application's use. Quite to the contrary, *Win* teaches allowing administrators to define roles based on functions users have in an organization. This has nothing to do with developing roles based on accessed items and types of access determined from an application's use.

Applicant notes the Examiner's assertion that *Win* discloses "developing a role associated with the application based on the determined accessed items and types of access (Col. 2, lines

35-47)" (Office Action, page 10). But what *Win* teaches, in actuality, is that defining roles involves identifying role names, identifying functional groups, and defining user types and that developing roles include listing functions or capacities in which a person might act (*Win*, column 14, lines 6-11). *Win* also teaches that role is then used in "identifying, at a second server coupled to the first server, a subset of resources that the user is authorized to access, based on one or more roles that are stored in association with the user identifying information" (*Win*, column 2, lines 31-34) (emphasis added).

Thus, *Win* does not teach developing roles based on the determined accessed items and types of access. Instead, *Win* teaches developing roles using an entirely different process and using the roles to identify resources a user is authorized to access. Thus, *Win* teaches evaluations based on a role which is developed by another process. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over *Win*.

Claims 2-9 depend from claim 1 and, hence, contain all of its limitations, which have already been shown to be allowable over *Win*. Claims 2-9 also contain additional limitations not taught by *Win*.

For example, claim 2 recites "capturing the database access statements; normalizing the database access statements; and eliminating redundancies in the database access statements." But *Win* does not teach capturing, normalizing, and/or eliminating redundancies in database access statements. Instead, *Win* teaches that duplicate roles are combined and as a result a normalized list of roles is created (*Win*, column 14, lines 14-18). Thus, *Win* does not teach performing processes on database access statements but rather teaches performing processes on roles as the roles are developed. Accordingly, claim 2 is further allowable over *Win*.

As another example, claim 5 recites "wherein developing a role comprises determining permissions for the application based on the determined accessed items and types of access." But *Win* does not teach that developing a role comprises determining permissions for an application based on determined accessed items and types of access. Instead, *Win* teaches granting access to a resource only when the roles associated with the user satisfy the access rule (*Win*, column 3, lines 40-41). That is, *Win* teaches granting access to resources based on roles rather than developing a role. Accordingly, claim 5 is further allowable over *Win*.

Independent claims 10 and 18 recite limitations similar to that of claim 1. In particular, the claims recite developing a role associated with an application based on determined accessed items and types of access. Accordingly, for reasons stated above in connection with claim 1, claims 10 and 18 are also allowable over *Win*. The dependent claims of claims 10 and 18 are also allowable for at least the reasons stated above in connection with claims 1, 10, 18, and 2-9.

Independent claim 23 recites limitations similar to that of claim 1. In particular, the claim recites developing a role associated with an application based on developed permissions, where permissions are developed based on accessed items and types of access. Accordingly, for reasons stated above in connection with claim 1, claim 23 is also allowable over *Win*.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

No fees are believed to be due at this time. If any extension of time is required, Applicant hereby requests the appropriate extension of time. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 05-0765.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 1, 2007

/Elizabeth Philip Dahm/
Elizabeth Philip Dahm
Reg. No. 51,352

PTO Customer No. 26230
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1717 Main Street
Suite 5000
Dallas, Texas 75201
Telephone: (214) 760-6119
Facsimile: (214) 747-2091

90209616.doc